

REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully reviewed in light of the cited references and the Examiner's comments, and accordingly, Applicants have combined the structure of allowable claim 42 with claim 41 and rewritten the claim as new claim 69. Thus Applicants believe that new claim 69 and dependent claim 70-84 are in condition for allowance with claims 22-26, 39 and 40, the allowance of which is hereby noted.

In reference to amended claim 57, Applicants' rows of reinforcing struts extend between the opposite core surfaces at acute angle relative to the webs and extend through the webs at locations spaced from the core surfaces, the struts comprise fibrous rovings enclosed by the strips, and the webs and the intersecting struts cooperate to resist buckling of the webs and the struts within the strips under loading for substantially increasing the strength of the structural panel incorporating the core panel. As the Examiner also suggested, Applicants are enclosing a Declaration setting forth the advantages of the fiber reinforced core panel having the structure set forth in amended claim 57.

Applicants are thoroughly familiar with the disclosure of Day '082 which has the same inventor as in the present application. However, there is no suggestion or teaching in Day '082 or in the European patent of Maquet '805 of Applicants' struts of fibrous rovings extending at acute angles relative to the webs and through the webs at locations spaced from the core surfaces, as Applicants disclose in connection with FIGS. 1-5 and set forth above in amended claim 57. Applicants also request that the rejection on double patenting be withdrawn in view of the fact that the structure of amended claim 57 is in no way suggested or taught by either reference. Applicants therefore believe that amended claim 57 and dependent claims 58-68 should also be in condition for allowance.

New claim 85 replaces cancelled claim 41 which was rejected over the disclosures of Day '082 and Mead et al '253. New claim 85 sets forth a core panel comprising a plurality of elongated strips of low density cellular material, a layer of fibrous rovings continuously and helically surrounding each of the strips along the length thereof, the elongated strips and helically surrounding rovings are connected together to form a unitized core panel, and the layer of rovings surrounding each strip being adjacent the layer of rovings of each laterally adjacent strip and extending over the core surfaces for receiving the skins and adapted to be moved as a unit to a molding process where the resin is hardened.

As the Examiner noted, Day '082 provides no disclosure or suggestion of a layer of fibrous rovings continuously and helically surrounding each of the strips. Moreover, Mead et al '253 discloses a tubular hose (FIG. 1) wherein strips (FIG. 2) of spaced foam blocks 11 carried by a hessian or fibrous backing strip 6 are helically wound in overlapping layers onto a tubular inner hose 5 with helically wound Mylar barrier films 13, 8A, 8B, 9 and 12 separating the overlapping layers of foam blocks between the tubular inner hose 5 and the outer tubular rubber sheath 18. There is nothing in Mead et al '253 suggesting or teaching a reconstruction of the core panel disclosed in Day '082 to arrive at Applicants' fiber reinforced core panel as set forth above in new claim 85 and which includes a layer of rovings helically surrounding each elongated strip of low density cellular material along the length thereof and with the layer of continuous rovings surrounding each strip being adjacent the layer of continuous rovings of each laterally adjacent strip and extending over the core surfaces, as Applicant discloses in connection with FIGS. 13 and 14. As a result, the continuous rovings helically surrounding each strip not only extend between adjacent strips but also extend over the opposite core surfaces to become part of the skins.


Serial No. 09/749.064

New dependent claim 86 correspond with previously allowable claim 42, and new dependent claim 88-99 correspond to dependent claims 71-82 which depend from allowable claim 69. Dependent claims 88-99, when combined with new claim 85, further set forth a combined structure which is neither suggested nor taught by any of the references. Since Mead et al '253 fails to suggest the structure of new claim 85, Applicants submit that dependent claims 86-99 should also be in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing and the enclosed Declaration, Applicants believe that each of independent claims 57, 69 and 85 and the claims dependent therefrom defines a fiber reinforced core panel which is clearly distinguished from the references. Accordingly, Applicants believe that these claims are in condition for allowance along with claims 22-26, 39 and 40, and respectfully request that this application be passed to issue. Applicants are also enclosing a Petition for a two month extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOX, MECKSTROTH & JENKINS



Alan F. Meckstroth
Reg. No. 22,607

AFM:pm
August 12, 2003
Dayton, Ohio 45419-1575
937/298-2811